

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. II.

NOVEMBER, 1922.

No. 11.

A Symposium on Religious Education.

PROF. J. H. C. FRITZ, St. Louis, Mo.

The religious education of children has, in the last few years, been given unusual attention by non-Lutheran Protestants. Books, pamphlets, and articles in church-papers have been written; schemes have been suggested and tried. We shall, first, quote some of the printed literature which is before us, and then, secondly, draw conclusions and offer some comment.

A folder, *Some Questions Frequently Asked upon Cooperation with the Public Schools for Week-day Religious Education*, gotten out by the Department of Religious Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church, says the following by way of introduction:—

It is generally conceded that the Sunday-school of the past has been a failure. Few will deny that it is totally unequal to the task of meeting the needs of the rising generation for religious training and instruction. But all must recognize with a shock that the statistics show the appalling number of public school children who have no relationship to any religious institution and are receiving no religious instruction.

There is a growing belief, expressed by earnest workers of all churches, who are vitally interested in child welfare, that some additional effort must be made to give the children of to-day, the citizens of to-morrow, an adequate life equipment. Religious education and training must be an integral and vital part of this equipment.

While welcoming all experiments and efforts of whatsoever kind that look forward to this end, we believe that if the ideals of Christian character are to be in any measure realized, more time must be secured for the child to live them, and the best time is school time.

From the same folder we quote the following questions and answers:—

What is meant by cooperation with the public schools for religious instruction? We mean that the public school authorities shall assign to the pupils, upon the definite request of the child's parents or guardian, a portion of his school time to be given up to religious instruction at such

time and place as shall be mutually agreed upon by parent and school authorities.

Does this cooperation mean that the school shall be responsible for or teach religion? No. Just the reverse. This cooperation makes the teaching of religion a thing entirely apart from the school. Upon the home must rest the responsibility for religious instruction and training.

Is this plan of cooperation a new idea of school relationships? Quite the contrary! It is a new appeal for our old friend, home cooperation. The school came into being to assist the home in the interests of the child. It was the definite answer to a definite need. When the home was swept along by the industrial revolution, it found itself unable to give the child the needed instruction and training to fit him for the changing conditions and added responsibilities of advancing civilization. This became the work of the school. Where possible, when the home failed, the school assumed the responsibility. The home surrenders the child to the school and supports the system by taxation. The surrender is not, however, entire and complete. The school cannot adequately deal with the entire development of the child. Therefore there are still obligations and responsibilities which the home cannot evade. The school has always recognized this. It is one of their most impressive slogans: "When the school and the home join hands, it is well with the child."

Are you asking the school to recognize religion in any way or to have any part in its teaching? Absolutely not! We are asking the school to cooperate with the home, in assigning, upon the definite request of the parent, a part of this time which the child looks upon as his "business time," to secure one of these extra school activities. The home considers this as necessary for the proper upbringing of the child, and since neither the home nor the school is competent to give this religious instruction, some other agency must.

Why do you consider religion as such a necessary part of the child's education? Without it our country is in grave peril! Our democracy was an experiment, brought forth by a people of strong religious convictions. These settled principles unconsciously colored their thoughts and actions. They entered into the solution of their life problems. They made certain things right and others wrong. After two generations from these forefathers we find that we have drifted away from this insistent and steadfast faith. Yet American liberty cannot long endure without this basic religious prepossession, for it is easy to see that spiritual illiteracy may become a social menace. Already we find that the absence of religious training explains many things that puzzle us in the reactions of the rising generations toward our modern problems. These problems are not in the last analysis merely and entirely economic. They are moral and religious issues. Why, for example, should not a man secure 500 per cent. for a common necessity? Why should he not profiteer as much as he pleases? The answer is, that as a moral and religious issue this is wrong! But unless the profiteer has such a religious prepossession, deep rooted and compelling, that will make him hear God's command in the Law "to do to all men as I would they should do unto me," he will do as he pleases. This duty to one's neighbor admits of no argument to one religiously trained, but it has no weight with one not so trained.

Will you give your idea more fully of the need of religious education? Do you mean to imply it is basic? I certainly do. Education means growth, unfolding, development of the entire child, mentally, physically, spiritually, and socially. Such a fourfold growth is suggested in that beautiful second chapter of St. Luke's gospel. Christ, then a child of 12, "went down with them and was subject unto them . . . and grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." This fourfold development suggested is soundly psychological. These must not be considered as independent and entirely separated departments of life that have no intimate relation to each other. They must not be considered as air-tight compartments that can be given attention at different times and at any time. They suggest, on the other hand, departments that are closely knit up together, are mutually interdependent, and shade off the one into the other. . . . Upon the home rests the responsibility for this nurture and unfolding. . . . If the home cannot do this alone, it must seek outside agencies to assist it, and it can naturally look for cooperation with all these assisting agencies when a vital issue is at stake. It is, therefore, very really the province of the home to seek the cooperation of the school in giving the child this peculiarly necessary training. The school is asked to simply assign a portion of its time, during its business hours, so that the child may have the right opportunity and point of view, and further to see that this time, in fairness to the school, is not used for anything else.

What supervision or oversight does the school system exercise over this week-day type of schools? None! They cooperate by assigning certain time and are responsible to the parent to see that this time is not used for anything else. This necessitates a system of reports back to the school covering the attendance problems. Simple printed forms have reduced this to a minimum of trouble.

Do you receive or expect to receive credit from the public schools for this work? No!

What is to become of the Sunday-school; do you advise its being discontinued? This would be a great mistake. Instruction and worship are the Church's ideal for Sunday. Instead of discontinuing it, the Sunday church-school must be brought to a higher plane of efficiency and service.

From a letter written, January, 1920, by the Superintendent of Schools, Herbert S. Weet, of the Department of Public Instruction, Rochester, N. Y., we quote the following:—

TO THE PARENT:—

At a recent meeting of the Board of Education the following resolution was passed concerning religious instruction:—

The importance of religious instruction both to the individual and to the country is generally recognized. By common consent, however, the free public school system of this country cannot teach religion. The responsibility for such instruction must rest upon the home and the Church. But the public school can and should cooperate to the limit of its power with the home and the Church to the end that the greatest possible number of our boys and girls may receive effective religious instruction.

Under the single teacher plan of school organization that usually prevails in the elementary school it is necessary that all pupils should remain in school during the entire day. But under the subject departmental plan of the upper high school, the subject-group departmental plan of the junior high school, and the semidepartmental plan now operative in some of the elementary schools, it is practicable, under certain conditions, to allow pupils to leave the school for a period of religious instruction without thereby interfering with their normal school progress.

Therefore Be It Resolved, That upon an approved application from any established religious body or society incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, the Board of Education cooperate in this work of religious instruction by excusing pupils for such instruction subject to the following provisions: —

1. Pupils shall be excused for religious instruction upon the written request of parents or guardians only.

2. The religious body desiring to give such instruction shall file with the Board of Education a written application stating the length of the course, the name and qualifications of the instructor, and the location and nature of the facilities that have been provided for this instruction. It shall, furthermore, furnish such reports of attendance and progress of pupils as the Board of Education may require.

By way of explanation the following statements were made: —

The resolution implies more of an attempt on the part of school authorities to determine the nature of the work done by those giving the religious instruction than we perhaps would care to claim in case any question arose. It seemed to us perfectly clear, however, that the outcome of this plan would depend so largely upon the type of teacher selected that we felt warranted in asking that the qualifications of the teacher should be a matter of regard in the application. The object was more to enable us to counsel with the Church authorities than to determine qualifications. . . .

Of course, the whole movement is experimental with us, but we regard it as an exceedingly important subject. We believe that the Church itself not only should assume full responsibility for securing the interest and cooperation of parents, but must assume such responsibility if the work is really to succeed.

From a circular giving "The Toledo Plan of Week-day Religious Instruction in Cooperation with the Public Schools," we quote the following: —

How ineffectual and inadequate is the usual program of the churches for religious education has never been so fully appreciated as at the present time. The religious workers of the World War give ample testimony to the ignorance about Christianity, the Bible, and the Church. The churches of Toledo are touching in any way less than fifty per cent. of the children of school age. A very large number of children have never been in Sunday-school. A larger number never use the Bible, and in hundreds of homes there are no Bibles. Teachers of English and his-

tory in our high schools say that it is the exceptional pupil who shows any knowledge of Bible characters and Bible allusion. Many know more about Greek and Roman mythology than they do about the Bible.

The Toledo Plan made the following provisions for the elementary grades:—

The Board of Education permits all children of the elementary grades whose parents make written application to the principal of the school to be dismissed one hour a week for the purpose of religious instruction.

The children of the first and second public school grades, when proper request has been filed, shall be dismissed on Mondays at 2.15; children of the third and fourth grades, on Tuesdays at 2.15; fifth and sixth grades, Thursdays at 2.15; seventh and eighth grades, Fridays at 2.15. This schedule applies to all the public schools of the city.

With reference to Sunday-school work, another circular says:

Religious instruction of any sort is given to less than half of the Protestant children of Toledo. The average attendance in the Sunday-schools is less than fifty per cent. The inadequate and often indifferent instruction given to the children in the Sunday-school half hour has made so little an impression on the children that the results are conspicuous in the lack of moral restraint, in the unwillingness to do Christian service, and in the lack of reverence for God and the Church on the part of the present generation. The Toledo plan of week-day religious instruction seeks to help the churches to overcome this neglect.

The President of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, William Douglas MacKenzie, in a booklet on *The Church and Religious Education*, writes:—

Where, as in this country and in France, the public school system, extending from the primary department even to the State university, has been divorced completely from religious education, efforts have been made of many different kinds, and on the whole with very indifferent success, to provide for the Christian education of the children and young men and women by means of special institutions. These include the Sunday-schools of the Church, the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. work in the cities and colleges, the Biblical chairs attached to many institutions of higher learning. In these cases the effort has arisen from sincerity, and it is often carried on with great devotion. But it has not succeeded in reaching that measure of power which is necessary for the thorough Christian education of the children and youth of the land. . . .

It is one of the most common complaints made by those interested in religious education that, while it is comparatively easy to gather the large majority of the younger children of the land for work in the Sunday-schools, it is increasingly difficult to retain them during the stages of adolescence and young manhood and womanhood. At these stages of their development the young people tend to pass beyond the reach of religious education. Consequently, the knowledge and impressions received when they were children fade away. Misunderstandings and prejudice occupy

their minds, and an appalling proportion of them become separated in interest from the Christian faith.

Manifestly, the Church will never be able to saturate national life with Christian principles, and bring an entire people into living fellowship with God so long as this drift of the boys and girls away from the educational influence of the Church continues unchecked.

In his book *The Week-day Church-School*, Walter Albion Squires, B. D., writes:—

If we count the whole Sunday-school hour as possessing educational value, the maximum time provided for Protestant children through this agency would be only fifty hours a year. It is doubtful whether the average Sunday-school secures more than a half hour of really educational work each Sunday. This would make the total time for a year twenty-five hours for each child making a perfect record of attendance, summer and winter. As a matter of fact, most Sunday-school children do not attend Sunday-school more than half of the time. Thus we see that the time allowance for Protestant religious education is meager, at best. . . .

Moreover, our meager time allowance for religious instruction is so unpedagogically distributed over the year as to render any valuable results doubly difficult of attainment. Half-hour lessons a week apart is a poor teaching arrangement. Continuity of instruction under such a system is well-nigh impossible. Many educators believe that a few weeks of continuous and intensive training is far more fruitful than fifty-two weeks of Sunday-school instruction. . . .

Twenty-five hours a year for religious education and one thousand hours a year for secular education is not a just ratio.

Mr. Squires mentions the following attempts to supplement the educational agencies of the Church: Vacation Bible-schools, summer schools of religion, community training-schools, occasional classes, parochial schools, pastor's communicant classes, preschool chapel services, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. classes, public school credits for outside Bible-study, and week-day church-schools.

With reference to parochial schools, Mr. Squires says:—

Practically the only Protestant denomination that depends on the parochial school for the religious instruction of its children is the Lutheran denomination. Among Lutheran people these schools are not uncommon. . . . The possibility of the Protestant denominations, as a whole, turning to the organization of parochial schools as a solution of their religious educational difficulties is so remote that it is hardly worth mentioning. The enrolment of a child in a parochial school means his elimination from the public school. Americans are well agreed that the public school is the bulwark of American democracy. The gathering of the children of the various denominations into parochial schools would mean that the churches would have to assume the burden of instructing them in secular studies as well as in religious subjects. The parochial school, for the reasons given, may as well be ruled out as a possible agency for the solution of Protestant educational problems.

From the book *The New Program of Religious Education*, by George Herbert Betts, we quote the following:—

The Protestant Church has never taken religious education seriously. This seems a strange, an ungracious, even a false thing to say of a church that has founded schools and colleges by the hundred, that, indeed, preceded the State in its support of general education. Nevertheless, it is true—the Church has never taken religious education seriously. It has been a great believer in, and promoter of, general education, but not of religious education. . . .

Throughout all its history it has been the policy of the Catholic Church to combine religious instruction with general education. In order to accomplish this purpose, as already indicated, Catholics in this country have quite generally desired to draw their children out from the public schools and send them to parochial schools run by the Church. In these schools religion has a regular part on each day's program, as much as arithmetic or geography. As was said earlier in the discussion, this thorough instruction in religion from childhood up is no doubt the chief factor in the ability of the Catholic Church to maintain itself.

The Jewish people in the United States have also carried on a more or less effective program of religious instruction for their children. This has differed from the policy of the Catholics, however, in that they have not taken their children out of the public schools in order to give them religious instruction on week-days. . . .

With the Protestant Church the problem has been somewhat different than in either of the two cases cited. In the earlier history of this country the curriculum of general education was distinctly religious. The old New England primer used for more than one hundred and fifty years as the child's sole introduction to reading and literature consisted almost wholly of distinctly religious material. The Bible was also regularly read and studied in the schools, as it was in the homes. Other religious books also formed a part of the school curriculum.

With the growth of the principle of the separation of Church and State, however, the curriculum of public education was naturally secularized, and religion dropped out of the public school course. Along with this change the church home seemed to lose much of its interest in instructing the child in religion. The result has been that the Protestant child has for the most part little or no religious instruction except that received in the Sunday-school and in occasional attendance at the general church sessions. This is to say that religion has been almost wholly lost out of his education and hence out of his general life equipment. . . .

The child in the average public school of the United States will, during most of the eight grades of the elementary school, have from fifty to sixty hours a year upon the subject of arithmetic. At the same time this child, even if he attends Sunday-school, is quite certain not to have more than six to ten hours of religious instruction during a year, and this under very unfavorable conditions. The result is that our children are not educated in religion as they are in the subjects of their public school course.

Upon such principles and reasoning the Church is recently coming

to ask for a division of public school time in order that the child may have a reasonable proportion of week-day time for instruction in religion. The time allowed on Sunday does not afford sufficient opportunity to give the basic instruction and training in religion which the child needs. . . .

Some have feared that the extending of instruction in religion over into week-day time will again introduce religion into the public schools, which is, of course, not the case. The principle of separation of Church and State is so thoroughly established in this country that it is no longer open to discussion. Those who are advocating week-day instruction in religion are not advising that this instruction be given in public schools, or by public school teachers, or under the supervision of public school authorities.

The Week-day Church-School is the name of a book written by Henry Frederick Cope, General Secretary of the Religious Education Association. The author, among other things, says in this book:—

The present agitation for week-day instruction means nothing less than the ultimate establishment of a new system of schools parallel to the public schools. It is well to foresee, as far as possible, the entire significance of this movement. It would be a mistake to suppose that such wide-spread planning and agitation are directed to nothing better than that Sunday-school teachers may add a week-day session to their present labors, or that children may meet during the week in order to listen to their pastors. Both these ends are quite desirable, as a rule, but they fall short of meeting the current pressing need. Such efforts cannot secure a worthy or adequate program of religious instruction. The week-day plans are much more serious, with purposes reaching farther and involving greater investments of persons and of money. . . .

Public education is curtailed as to its curriculum. It is forced to omit an essential subject. Public education in the United States is thoroughly secularized.

Now, this does not involve secularization in any reprehensible sense; it need not and ought not to mean that public education is destructive of spiritual idealism. School people do not have to be materialists. The fact that the school cannot teach religion does not set it in opposition to religion. So far as the theory of freedom is concerned, it only means that religion as a definite subject of study is excluded from the curriculum of public schools.

But it must be evident to any one that a system of education that omits religion in its training for life tends to train for a life that omits religion.

In the book *Religion among American Men*, by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, we read:—

It is upon the Sunday-school that the Protestant churches have mainly depended for any systematic religious education of the children and youth. It is found in practically every church in every community. Yet the ignorance of young men as to the vital meaning of Christianity,

so clearly disclosed in the cross section of youth that we had in the army, is an indication that the Sunday-school must have been seriously ineffective in its work.

We can briefly draw certain conclusions from the facts stated in the premises:—

1. It is admitted that the Sunday-school has in the past been insufficient for the religious education of children.

2. It is admitted that the Sunday-school, even where brought to its highest state of efficiency, cannot sufficiently provide for the religious education of children.

3. It is admitted that, unless the children of our country receive more religious education, a dire calamity will result for the home, the State, and the Church.

4. It is admitted that Church and State must remain separate, and that, therefore, religious instruction must not be given nor supervised by the public school or the State.

5. It is admitted that the home (the parent) is responsible for the religious education of the child.

6. It is admitted that the home, under present circumstances, must be given assistance in the religious education of a child, and that such assistance should be given by the Church.

7. Some are in favor of having the public school turn over the children to their churches for religious instruction during certain hours of the regular school time.

8. Some are in favor of giving religious instruction during the week, after the regular school-hours.

9. Some believe that each denomination should take care of its own children; others favor interdenominational religious community schools (but not parochial schools).

10. Protestants, outside of the Lutheran Church, are, as a rule, not willing to solve the problem of religious education by establishing the parochial school and thus are not willing to act in accordance with their own findings and suggestions.

Comment is hardly necessary as far as our readers are concerned. The whole situation of religious education as we have it before us speaks in favor of the parochial school. The problem which others are trying to solve our Synod has solved long ago. From the very beginning our Synod has used the parochial school as a means of assisting parents in giving their children a Christian education. We ought to thank God that we have the parochial school, and ask Him graciously to keep it for us. It is refreshing to find some one occasionally outside of our Lutheran circles who,

at least in a measure, understands and appreciates why we Lutherans establish and maintain our church-schools. The president of a Christian Endeavor academy, Walter M. Ellis, in an article on "What Is Christian Education?" in the *Congregationalist* of August 4, 1921, writes as follows:—

Again it appears necessary to insist that the education provided so liberally and so efficiently in our public school system is in no distinctive sense Christian education. True, it can but have in it Christian elements, for our people as a whole are at least nominally Christian, and our teachers are commonly consistent Christian men and women. But identically the same thing may truthfully be said of the greater number of corporate business and industrial institutions. . . .

Historically, the Christian Church has held that it could conquer, in the line of its great vision, only as it used the educational processes and institutions. At the same time, from the standpoint of desirable educational results, it has held that education is true, united, complete, vital, and sufficiently motived only as it was Christian. This conception of the normal inseparability of essential, living Christianity from the body of education as a whole is still held bravely by the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches, and, as many believe, will always be held by them. In this immediate connection, also, it may be observed that even the Protestant churches still hold to the historic view in all their foreign mission work, nowhere undertaking to push the conquest of heathendom without the old instrument of Christian education in their various schools.

There now exists in America a group of schools, a group relatively small as compared with the mighty and growing body of tax-supported schools, yet, taken all together, by no means despicable or without characteristic and beneficent influence, whose history and foundation is such that they are free to cherish and to seek to realize this distinctive, historic conception of a positive Christian education. Indeed this, and nothing less, is their unique function. Let us not fail to encourage their administrators in their high task. Let us not cease to call them proudly our Christian schools. Let our Christian parents be led to a keener appreciation of what these Christian schools may do for their children.

A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

14. ATTEMPT TO STRENGTHEN STATE CHURCH INFLUENCE ON E. F. S.

The treatise on *Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation* appeared shortly before the annual meeting of *Stiftelsen* in 1908 and could not have been read by many delegates to the conference. It is possible that the majority of them had not even an inkling of the matter. Notwithstanding this, men

were looking forward to this meeting with some mental tension. For there was another issue, launched likewise by Prof. A. Kolmodin, that produced unrest. After conferences with the Archbishop and with another member of the Mission Board of the Swedish state church, the professor had decided to suggest to the directors of *Stiftelsen* that the periodical *Sjoemannsvaennen* (*Seaman's Friend*) be made the joint organ of *Stiftelsen* and the Seamen's Mission of the Swedish state church. The motion roused opposition among the directors, but the professor succeeded in overcoming the opposition to the extent that after long deliberation the directors agreed to support the motion in its main point, and it was merely a matter of words that remained unsettled. The professor wanted to have it announced in the periodical that the latter was the organ of the mission of the *state church*, while his opponents desired to have it clearly stated that it represented an *Evangelical Lutheran* mission.

The matter had been known beforehand, and *Nya Vaektaren*, which treated the issue in a special article, took the position that the *entire* matter should be declined, because it was unquestionably the first step towards merging *Stiftelsen* completely in the state church. As later events showed, that was the way in which the conference disposed of the matter.

15. TEACHER LOEFDAHL'S GRIEVANCE.

Since the controversy regarding reconciliation by Christ was closed, the conferences of *Stiftelsen* had been marked by unanimity and concord. At the jubilee conference in 1906 there had been strife regarding the question of pensioning the laborers of E. F. S. Also at the conference in 1907 there had been some dissatisfaction with the suggestion of the directors that negotiations be begun with the *Svenska Missionsfoerbundet* (Swedish Mission Society) regarding a joint hymn-book. But all this was nothing compared to what was to happen now. Already when the Auditing Committee made its report, Teacher K. Loeftdahl asked for the floor. He was one of *Stiftelsen's* oldest and most reliable friends, who for nearly forty years had stood as a pillar among the E. F. S. people. He called the attention of the conference to the fact that during the past year the directors had taken the liberty of permitting a novel to be published by the publication house of the E. F. S. Assuredly the novel was written so as to have a Christian appearance, still, it was a novel. Besides, the subject which it treated was hardly suited to young people. The speaker regretted very much that he had been

placed under the necessity of dragging this matter into the conference, but he had no other choice after it had become manifest that the directors were turning a deaf ear to all admonitions addressed to them regarding the matter.

16. PROFESSOR KOLMODIN DRAWN INTO THE DISCUSSION.

In the discussion which now followed Prof. J. O. Rosenberg was given the floor first. He asserted that it was well-nigh impossible that any improper literature could be issued by *Stiftelsen's* publishing house, so carefully did the committee of revisers revise all books submitted for publication. The speaker was himself the chairman of the committee, and it was not possible that both he and the other members should allow anything to slip through that was as improper as Teacher Loeftdahl would regard the book in question. It was maintained over against Professor Rosenberg's assertion that, although there was no intention to charge the committee with incompetency, it would not do to regard the committee as infallible, for, shortly before conference convened, there had been published "in commission" by the publishing house of E. F. S. a treatise which expressed views regarding the Bible that never had been and with God's help never would be the views of *Stiftelsen*. However, since this matter was an affair of the administration for the current year, it would not come up for settlement until at a later meeting.

Here, now, the first word was spoken on the burning question. It was immediately answered by Professor Kolmodin, who remarked that the last speaker had evidently referred to the book *Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation*. He requested that this matter be disposed of immediately. Rightly the opposition declared that this was impossible because most of the delegates had now heard of the treatise for the first time. In the absence of any motion to do something the result of the discussion was that the directors were held responsible for their action.

17. PASTOR WADSTROEM'S WARNING.

After this the question was taken up whether or not an institute should be erected for the training of "Bible women." A brisk skirmish ensued between the loyal friends of *Stiftelsen* and those who inclined exclusively towards the state church. During this debate Pastor B. Wadstroem remarked that ministers were not as they used to be. There was now hardly any distinction made between converted and unconverted ministers. A general ministers' union had been formed, and as long as some one was

a brother in office, it was occasionally regarded as being of less importance whether he was a brother in conscience. Also in *Stiftelsen* a change had taken place. The speaker said that he was an old man, and his conscience bade him speak the truth. Accordingly, he wished to tell conference that during the last year there had been noticeable among the directors of *Stiftelsen* an extreme timidity that was deplorable. Quite often remarks like these could be overheard: "What will state church people say to that?" "What will the minister think of it?" Moreover, when the speaker was a young man, the directors of *Stiftelsen* had been careful not to give any offense or rouse ill will; if they could only answer to God for their actions, they were content to let unbelieving ministers think what they pleased. "In fifty years," said the speaker, "has *Stiftelsen* had no enemy in our country besides the state church, all its really alive and believing ministers excepted. But the uncouth world has been friendlier to us and accorded us better recognition than the unconverted ministers." The speaker concluded his remarks with an admonition to *Stiftelsen* not to turn aside from its course either to the right or to the left.

However, the chief contest at this conference was concerning the question, whether *Sjoemannsvaennen* should become the joint organ of *Stiftelsen* and the Seamen's Mission of the Swedish state church. After a discussion lasting several hours the matter was postponed till the next annual meeting, when it was pushed into the background and entirely dismissed.

The meeting of 1908 had turned out fortunately for the friends of *Stiftelsen*, who held fast the old position of E. F. S. and to a great extent could be said to have found in *Nya Vaektaren* their organ. The men on the other side had been so secure that they had not deemed it necessary to mobilize their forces. But the victory which had been won in 1908 was already the next year to be turned into a defeat.

18. THE CLASH BETWEEN KOLMODIN AND SVENSSON.

The next weeks after the conference in 1908 passed quietly, until Professor Kolmodin broke the silence by inserting in the mission periodical of *Stiftelsen* an article written by himself, in which the treatise on *Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation* was praised and defended. In this article several cuts were dealt to the editor of *Nya Vaektaren*, Axel B. Svensson, for the remarks he had made about the professor's book. This caused the editor to demand that the professor publish a cor-

rection in the mission periodical. The professor first refused this, then promised it. He carried out his promise by inserting what Svensson had written in such a garbled form that it was meaningless. In the correspondence which now occurred between Kolmodin and Svensson the former related that for a number of years he had held the position which had been published in the controverted book, and had communicated his views to the students at Johannelund, and these had expressed to him "again and again" their gratitude for these views. He stated furthermore: "Quite recently I heard of one of our older representatives, who was not my student, that, after he had returned from conference, he took my book, withdrew, and read it through, carefully examining every quotation, with the result that he thanked God for the book."⁷) Besides, the professor in this correspondence made the greatest efforts to represent Svensson as double-faced, because at the election of directors he had not voted for the professor. Moreover, Svensson was accused of having started the trouble for Kolmodin in a spirit of revenge, and besides, the professor declared Svensson an almost entirely incompetent person.⁸) The accusations of vengefulness and duplicity were repelled with moderation and firmness by Editor Svensson, who stated that he had never had occasion to harbor enmity against the professor; for the latter had always treated him in a friendly manner and placed confidence in him.

7) The party referred to by Kolmodin is O. A. Allard. Many circumstances render this assumption not only probable, but almost certain. While Supreme Court Justice Widstroem was living, Allard in his letter would occasionally "thank God" for the *Torch*, and in his lectures as traveling representative of E. F. S. would oppose Bible criticism in every form. At the conference in 1909 Mr. Allard stated that for more than twenty years he had held the same views regarding the Bible as Professor Kolmodin, and for this reason he voted in favor of giving the professor a vote of confidence in his doctrinal position. At the conference in 1911 Allard said very chestily that he desired to hear no more about his having given his approval to Kolmodin's position, for that was "a lie."

8) As a curiosity it may be interesting in this connection to note the opinion which Professor Kolmodin before the controversy expressed regarding Editor Svensson. It is stated in the following testimonial: "By these presents I testify that the public school teacher Axel Svensson is well known to me for some time, that he has made an impression upon me as a decided, proved Christian personality, and that he possesses a goodly stock of information acquired through private study, and a more than ordinary talent for expounding the Word unto edification with fidelity to the text and the Confessions.

"Stockholm, May 7, 1907.

AD. KOLMODIN, *Professor.*"

19. ANDERSSON'S THUNDER-PEAL.

After this controversy there was quiet for a while. But between the *Torch* and Kolmodin there was an exchange of polemics, in which the latter was so completely routed that his defeat could hardly have been worse. However, this part of the controversy was lost upon the great majority of *Stiftelsen's* friends, because, sad to say, they did not side with the *Torch*. Then there was quiet once more, but it was the quiet before the storm breaks. Throughout the country there was unrest among the mission-friends. Everybody was waiting for something to happen. Something did happen.

In the month of November the traveling representative of the society, Alfred Andersson, published a little treatise inscribed *Settlement of Accounts with Professor Kolmodin and His Book "Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation."* (*Vidraekning med prof. Kolmodin och hans bok*, etc.) Like a flash of lightning the treatise released the electric tension and broke up the uncertainty that had prevailed till then. The first impression of *Vidraekning* on many was that they were completely dumbfounded. But it roused attention to the question at issue. It spoke out clearly and said that there was danger approaching. There was no cotton wound around the arrow-heads in this treatise, and although some were of the opinion that the author's choice of words and expressions could have been better, it was nevertheless admitted that *Vidraekning* was just such a thunder-peal as the situation called for. If there was anything exaggerated in the treatise, the author himself had to suffer the consequences, and no one has heard him raising a complaint or retracting anything. If any misunderstanding existed, it was the fault of Professor Kolmodin and the Board of Revisers, because through their ambiguous circumlocutions they had given occasion for misunderstandings.

20. ANDERSSON BEFORE "STIFTELSEN."

Any one that read *Vidraekning* could easily understand that the treatise must rouse an unheard-of excitement in *Stiftelsen*. Now that all is over, one does not know what to regard as most surprising, traveling representative Andersson's calmness in meeting the consequences of his treatise or the inconsistency with which *Stiftelsen's* directors, having lost their heads, now went into the fray. When Professor Kolmodin attacked and criticized Bible-statements of which the Apostle Peter says that they were spoken

by the Holy Ghost, the directors of *Stiftelsen* were prompt in passing a resolution to aid the professor in getting these strictures on the Word of God printed and spread among the mission-friends. But when traveling representative Andersson criticized the human being Kolmodin, the directors of *Stiftelsen* hurriedly issued a warning against Andersson's treatise, forbade its dissemination, and summoned its author for a hearing before *Stiftelsen*. At this hearing, which took place shortly before July, 1908, Andersson in his defense asked to be told whether the directors of *Stiftelsen* approved Kolmodin's book *Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation*. This question was answered with a distinct *yes* by Professor Rosenberg with the silent consent of the other members of the directorate. However, nothing was accomplished at the hearing. The directors sought in every possible way to induce Andersson in some manner to join them in expressing regret either concerning *Vidraekning* as a whole or concerning some part of it. But Andersson would not consent to this. In refusing to make the admission which the directors desired, Andersson without question acted prudently, for an admission of this doubt would, of course, have been interpreted as a retraction. Those who are acquainted with Alfred Andersson are well aware that he would not claim infallibility in anything for himself. He was constrained by his conscience to speak when everybody else kept silent.

21. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS.

It soon became apparent that the directors must come out plainly with an admission such as they had desired Andersson to make. For before the close of the year the publishing house of *Stiftelsen* issued a little brochure which was sent to all representatives and congregations. In this brochure the directors sought to shift the blame for the trouble that had arisen from themselves and Professor Kolmodin to Alfred Andersson, who was criticized in sharp terms, while Kolmodin was praised. At the same time, however, the directors tried to open up a way of retreat for themselves by saying that they could not endorse *all* statements of Kolmodin. Besides, the uncertain manner in which the directors expressed themselves on the confessional question involved in the issue was apt to raise doubts against them. For about this time the directors published a statement regarding the confessional question. It was so cunningly worded that the members of the directorate who were loyal to the Confessions believed that they had put forth a statement so correct that only men really believing in the Bible could

subscribe it. But there was a back door in it which the secretary had kept open for Bible critics, so that even these subscribed the statement. Nor did it take long before the leaders of the two factions again had each other by the hair.

22. ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO EXTEND STATE CHURCH INFLUENCE.

About this time a convention of the state church, upon motion of Bishop Loevgren in Vaesteraas, took steps to set up a so-called Deaconess Directorate. In the public press the leaders in this movement gave an explanation of the same of such a nature that a good many of the voluntary forces in the state church saw their uncircumscribed existence threatened. The result was that some of the leading men in the *Society for the Promotion of Pastoral Care by the Church* sought an approach to that part of *Stiftelsen* which was represented by *Nya Vaektaren*. Several conferences actually took place, in which wholesale merchant Joh. Eriksson, Pastor Efr. Rang, and Editor Axel B. Svensson participated as members of *Stiftelsen*. But when it became known that Pastor Rang at the same time was holding individual consultations partly with the editor of the *Svensk Kyrkatidning* (*Swedish Church Journal*), partly with the secretary of the *Svenska Missionsfoerbundet* (*Swedish Mission Society*), Eriksson and Svensson withdrew from these conferences. The result was, on the one hand, that the negotiations with the men of the *Society for Pastoral Care* came to a halt, and, on the other hand, that Pastor Rang lost his place in the editorial committee of *Nya Vaektaren*.

23. "HOLD THAT FAST WHICH THOU HAST."

On New Year's Eve 1908 there issued from the press a new publication in the Kolmodin controversy. It bore this title: *Hold That Fast which Thou Hast. . . . A Contribution to the Discussion of Prof. A. Kolmodin's Treatise: "Christianity and the Bible of the Primitive Christian Congregation,"* by Axel B. Svensson. The author of this publication applied to the directors of *Stiftelsen*, asking them to approve the selling of his treatise by the book concern of E. F. S. At first it seemed as if this treatise would not cause any change in the policy hitherto followed by the directors. Editor Svensson was summoned before General Rapp, who thanked him for the part which he was taking in the debate, expressed his full agreement with the believing position which he had taken in his treatise *Hold That Fast which Thou Hast*, and promised that the treatise should be sold by *Stiftelsen's* book concern. The direc-

tors passed a resolution to the same effect. For several weeks it looked as if the directors meant to take a definite stand against Bible criticism.

However, it became plain very soon that several parties among the members of the directorate passed another resolution to remain neutral, with a friendly leaning towards Kolmodin's side, even if they did not fully identify themselves with the professor. For on March 16, 1909, the publishing house of *Stiftelsen* sent to all its traveling representatives and preachers a circular letter in which the sale both of Kolmodin's controverted book and the brochures of Andersson and Svensson were forbidden. However, the directors continued the spreading both of Kolmodin's and Svensson's writings through *Stiftelsen's* book concern in Stockholm. Besides, the preachers were forbidden to express themselves on the issue either privately or publicly. Ephoral Provost J. G. Hellenius, who most strongly advocated these measures, had a few days before written to Editor Svensson, amongst other things, the following: "For some time I have been wanting to say a few words to Mr. Svensson, after I had read your treatise against Kolmodin. The book is a calm and matter-of-fact presentation of the issue; it contains matter for which we must be grateful, and quite certainly expresses what the Christian masses think." Nevertheless the book must now be prohibited. Here was the evidence that the directors were afraid to take a definite stand because they feared that the majority of the conference would be against them.

In order to ascertain the views of people throughout the country there was sent out, with the knowledge and consent of Assistant Secretary C. A. Hedlund, from Kristianstadt a petition requesting signatures in behalf of Kolmodin. When *Nya Vaektaren* took this matter up, the directors hastily declined all responsibility for the affair, but at the publishing house the names on the list were carefully added up, and when the conference met, this list was used by the Secretary, Pastor J. Montelius, as an argument for Kolmodin.

24. THE JUDGMENT OF OUTSIDERS.

During the following months the directors were being helplessly tossed to and fro like a ball between the two factions whose representatives in the directorate sought support and counsel from its congenial friends without the directorate. Finally the majority of the directors became firmly inclined towards Kolmodin. But all their utterances on the matter at issue had been so vacillating that they could rightly be characterized by the following words of *Svensk*

Kyrkatidning: "The directors of *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen* in their utterances hitherto have been so cautious that actually one hardly knows what position they occupy."

It became apparent that even outside of the circle of *Stiftelsen's* friends the clashing of spirits in the society was attracting a great deal of attention. The public press took up the issue, and it is significant that its writers, men hostile to Christianity, decidedly sided with Kolmodin.

It was likewise significant that the issue was referred to at the pastoral conference at Goeteborg, when Pastor Valdus Bengtsson, speaking on the subject "Instruction in Christianity in Our Public Schools," dragged the issue into his address. In his opening remarks he dwelt chiefly on the essentially unlike views regarding the inspiration of Scripture which in our time are being defended. He introduced four types: 1. George Brandell in his book *Instruction in Christianity and the People's School*, in which the position is taken that the present instruction in Christianity ought to be absolutely abolished and supplanted by a naturalistic element or by a history of religion; 2. New Protestantism, or negative idealism; 3. Professor Kolmodin, who holds that in the Bible there is found God's living Word for our salvation, but also other matters, relating to geography, history, natural science, regarding which the theory of verbal inspiration is untenable; 4. traveling representative Alfred Andersson, preacher Axel B. Svensson, the periodical *Torch*, and others, which hold the old view of the Bible, viz., that Holy Scripture is the Word of God. The speaker, who personally was a zealous follower of the views held by Kolmodin, characterized the various positions quite correctly.

Conference⁹⁾ was drawing near; the great clash was to occur, and each side was mobilizing all its forces.

25. PREPARATIONS FOR THE CONFERENCE OF 1909.

As might have been expected, the weeks immediately preceding the convention of 1909 developed a feverish activity, which aimed at insuring victory for Kolmodin's views. The majority of the directors was now definitely resolved to support the professor; however, through the carelessness of one of their members their purpose was accidentally revealed. For in one of the daily papers of Stockholm there appeared an interview of "one of the leading men in the directorate," in which the statement was made that the

9) The annual convention of *Stiftelsen*.

directors were going to the impending convention with confidence, because it was hoped that Professor Kolmodin would make a few "seeming concessions in minor details, and that as a result of this the opposition would split asunder." In this hope the directors were disappointed, chiefly perhaps because their purpose had become known; at the convention the opposition showed itself able to hold together.

With great foresight the directors had drawn up their plan of battle. For instance, on the day before the convention a preparatory meeting was held, which was attended by all representatives and delegates of congregations belonging to the society. At this meeting the issues on the convention's program were discussed for several hours. The directors had a list of various subjects for consideration, and for each and every one of them they had appointed three speakers to lead off in the discussion, all of them men who would likely support the directors. Moreover, these speakers were to be given ample time, but when later those dissatisfied with Bible criticism were to ask for the floor, they were to be limited to three minutes for each speaker. Under these circumstances it was wisest for the *Bibeltrognä* (believers in the Bible) not to enter into any debate: they had to reserve their arguments till the next day, when the decisive battle would be fought. However, a few of them allowed themselves to be drawn out in reply to personal attacks, and thus the strife was in full blast.

(To be continued.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Africa.—A recent issue of the *Zululand Times* contained the following open letter:—

TO THE EDITOR, "ZULULAND TIMES":

SIR:—A word please *re* the article "Religion and Reason" in the issue of Thursday, July 13. I think that Bishop Talbot, of Pretoria, is taking upon himself a terrible responsibility in scattering broadcast his opinions about the inspiration of the Bible, in view of the words of the Savior, Matt. 5, 18: "For verily I say unto you: Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled." I prefer to believe what the Bible is asserting of itself, 2 Tim. 3, 16: "All Scripture is given by inspiration . . . for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

It is not true that no scholars to-day refuse to acknowledge errors and self-contradictions in the Bible. I could, for instance, point to

a Lutheran church-body in America, the Missouri Synod, this year celebrating its seventy-fifth jubilee. It has more than three thousand professors and pastors, more than one million church-members, all professing with one mouth that "all Scripture is given by inspiration." This church-body has strong outposts and missions in many, many countries amongst Christians and heathens. One of their professors, Dr. F. Pieper, has just issued a dogmatic work in three big volumes that I should think might perhaps be the most important Protestant dogmatic work issued for centuries.

I have no doubt that even scholars in the church represented by the Bishop of Pretoria are fully able and willing to take the bishop to task.

I am, etc.,

Entumeni.

H. J. S. ASTRUP.

The writer is a Norwegian, well known in our circles, who went to South Africa years ago to do mission-work. D.

United Norwegian Church. — A hopeful voice is raised in behalf of religious liberty by the *Lutheran Church Herald* (September 5). The editor notes the statement sent out by the "Religious Liberty Association" of Washington, D. C., concerning the attempt made in Oregon and Oklahoma to abolish private and parochial schools, and parallels this attempt with the futile one made in Michigan two years ago. He goes on to say: "In the first amendment to the Federal Constitution the provision establishing religious liberty is limited to acts of Congress. The various States have, regardless of this Federal provision, the right to do as they choose, although most States have the same provision as the Constitution of the United States in their charters. — One of the priceless blessings we have in this country is our religious liberty, but every once in a while some one feels called upon to interfere and try to impose his views upon some one else and curtail the liberties of his fellow-men by some restrictions. — America stands for religious liberty: That every man shall enjoy the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The same liberty before the law is granted to the believer in the Bible, the Zend Avesta, the Upanishads, the Koran, the Book of Kings, the Shaster, and the infidel as long as their religious practises do not interfere with public morality. We hope that the time will never come when our State legislatures or our Congress shall try to introduce any of the elements of the inquisition, either in favor of some kind of religion or against religion. A man's conscience cannot be regulated by legal enactments backed up by police and military authority. We feel confident that the people of Oregon and Oklahoma are not willing to be deprived of this inalienable right. Let us hope that the 100 per cent. fanatics will not be able to deceive the progressive people of these States into passing any such reactionary, medieval laws." What lover of the United States does not share this truly patriotic sentiment? The spirit of the times is decidedly hostile to the old American ideals of liberty. Whence came our liberty? The average citizen will say: From an act of Congress. He is correct, looking at the matter from his secular view-point.

From this view-point, however, the grant of our American liberties will rarely be more than a political expediency, that can be and ought to be supplanted by something else when changed conditions demand it. Even now there are numerous voices raised that clamor for an adaptation of the Constitution to the needs of a new age, etc. What men have made men will unmake when it suits their ends to do so, and they have sufficient political power to do so. From the secular political view-point there is nothing permanent about the liberal provisions of our Constitution. Let no one be deceived on this point. It is not likely that the Constitution will be abrogated, but it is not impossible that it will be slowly amended to death, and men who appeal fervently to its provisions as originally framed will discover that they are hugging a corpse. The Christian citizen of the United States regards his liberties under our Constitution as a heavenly boon, come down from the Father of Lights, like any other good gift. It came through men, but God wanted it to come. He designed it as a blessing for men, especially for His believing children. These recognize the mercy and favor that lies in the grant of these liberties. They are grateful for them, and humbly and earnestly pray for their preservation. But God, too, can take away these liberties, or suffer them to be taken away, because men do not make the right use of them, and even His Christians have failed to make the best of the glorious opportunities which a benign Providence had created for them in the land of the free. Also from the spiritual view-point we hold no absolute deed of ownership to our liberties. We may need the punishment that may come with the abrogation of these liberties. Our times are most serious and critical times, and the spirit of tyranny and persecution that is abroad in our land should incite us to repentance for the purification of our faith and to incessant prayer.

D.

"Internal Enemies of Christian Education." — Under this heading, the *Sunday Watchman* (August 6, 1922) says: "Catholics are being much excited by the attacks made on parochial schools in different parts of the country. This commotion shown by the good people is a sign that their faith is living. But the same is not an indication that their faith is as intelligent as it might be, for while they are praying against the external enemies of our school system, they are doing nothing to resist its internal enemies. These are of two classes. The first class is made up of those parents who will not send their children to a Catholic school and all grown-ups who for want of proper training will not themselves go to a Catholic school. The other class is made up of those who are too apathetic to encourage Catholic education, either morally or financially. In membership each class is legion — doing the devil's work a hundred times more effectively than the demoniac band which the Lord permitted to possess the herd of hogs. However, let the ardent advocates of Catholic education remember that these internal enemies can be converted into friends. As much campaigning for this mainstay of the Church in America as you and I are doing for our favorite candidates for political offices will effect the change." — What the *Watchman* says

concerning internal enemies applies also to certain internal enemies of Christian education in other denominations. External enemies of Christian education are not as dangerous as those that lurk within the pale of the Church. If we shall lose our own Christian day-schools, it is because we neither esteem them nor effectually work for them.

MUELLER.

The National Boy Movement.—The *Sunday Watchman* (August 13, 1922) reports editorially: "The press reports that the Knights of Columbus at their Atlantic City convention appointed a committee to look into the whole question of a junior organization. The Masons, of course, are caring for their youngsters, especially in the De Molay order. This latter is a secret society, and takes boys as young as twelve. The sons of Masons and the chums of these sons are eligible to membership. The Knights are in a position to launch a boy movement, a movement that will have its own intrinsic merits, and still serve as a training-school of Columbians. But the movement must not be secret. We must not take boys at an age at which they should be at home. Between fourteen and eighteen would seem to be the desired years of eligibility. The boy could be taken when he leaves the eighth grade, when the ordinary boy starts to work, and be given such help to develop and enjoy himself as he would otherwise lack." No doubt this movement will be launched sooner or later. The Roman Catholic Church is always watchful, and has a rare ability to turn lessons, learned from its enemies, to practical usefulness. What the editorial says of the De Molay order is true. It is a secret order under the fostering care of Masons. When, however, the writer states that the Catholic junior organization must not be secret, he prevaricates. The Knights of Columbus are as much a secret organization as the Masons, and their secret machinations and plottings are as dangerous to the cause of the Gospel and to the welfare of our free republic as those of any other secret organization. Rome is certainly on the alert to guard its own and promote its prestige.

MUELLER.

Agassiz and Evolution.—If evolutionists claim that every scientist in the last half century has been an evolutionist, the following narrative taken from *Random Memories* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co.) written by Ernest Wadsworth Longfellow, the son of the great poet, proves the contrary. The author says: "With all of Agassiz's charm and good nature, the mention of Darwin and his theory acted upon him like a red rag to the bull, and he would become so excited and furious that it would be wise to drop the subject as quickly as possible. Then he would calm down with a great burst of laughter at his own rage. He would never allow that Darwin had a leg to stand on, and always argued that if the Creator could make many species develop from one, He could equally and with more reason create all the different species. I do not know whether he ever changed his mind or even accepted what all the rest of the scientific world came to accept as one of the fundamental principles of creation—the development of species." We are pleased that Ernest Wads-

worth Longfellow did not hesitate to narrate this incident. To deny the claims of Darwinism — and scientists have long modified the original views of Darwin — does not discredit the great Agassiz, but rather proves that he was indeed a great scientist, that is, a scholar holding rigidly to facts and disavowing unproved hypotheses, even though the whole scientific world should accept them. This class of scholars seems to have become extinct in our time. MUELLER.

The Ministry of Healing. — The *Churchman* (August 19, 1922) very urgently endorses the ministry of healing. Writing editorially it says: "For at least two decades psychotherapy has been practised by clergymen of our church. We are convinced that the ministry of healing has scarcely entered upon its great career of service to humanity. That the religion of Jesus Christ can heal both the souls and the bodies of God's children is increasingly becoming the conviction of churchmen. It is a buoyant and health-giving faith to hold. Men and women in their pain, doubt, and despair are clinging to the *healing* Christ. The new knowledge gives support to this faith. It is likely to transform the practise of religion and to bring back worship and ardor to the hearthstone of the homes. Let us have a ministry of healing! Let us encourage it and give to it the support of our best intelligence!" We believe that rather the contrary will take place. If the Christian ministry ventures to heal bodies instead of souls and lays stress on the elimination of earthly trouble instead of the spiritual trouble of sin, there will be far less worship and ardor than there is now. Of course, every Christian pastor will pray also for the temporal well-being of his parishioners, particularly for the restoring of the sick, if it be God's will. However, if Christian ministers become psychotherapists, they are sure to cease to be evangelists. The social gospel of our day is seeking many doors by which to enter the Church and displace the Gospel of salvation.

MUELLER.

Religious Books Popular. — "A publishing firm in the United States in the first four months of 1922," says the *Christian Register* (August 13, 1922), "published seventy new volumes on religious subjects. The *London Times*, speaking of books issued in Great Britain in 1922, states that while the greatest number consisted of works of fiction, books on religion came next. There were 967 works of fiction and 563 volumes on theology or other forms of religious activity. Publishing houses are criticized for rejecting manuscripts that have 'literary merit' and accepting only those whose chief recommendation is that they will sell. However, the making of books is a business and is as much a commercial venture as the manufacture of shoes or the establishing of a transatlantic line of steamships. The first business of those who are making books is to find out as accurately as possible what the public read yesterday and what it will read tomorrow. If these men are printing religious volumes in increasing quantities, they are printing them because they serve a growing demand. Writers on religious subjects who treat their themes in a serious, convincing, and readable manner are sure of an appreciative

circle of readers. The books on the relation of business and religion, written by Roger Babson, have had a wide sale because they were written by a writer who knew how to state universal truths in a positive, forceful way. Religion is a living issue — as living as medicine, law, or business. Religious books, authorities a dozen years ago, are no longer reliable, for new truths are constantly being unearthed and library shelves must be cleared to make way for them. There is reason enough why religious books are the best sellers among works other than fiction." — The foregoing remarks on a greater interest in religious books we find substantiated in other periodicals and papers that deal with the sale of books. The fact is that people in our time are assiduously reading books, both orthodox and otherwise, and this suggests the duty to place upon the market an ever-increasing number of religious books that set forth the truth of the Christian religion and ward off the uncountable errors scattered broadcast to-day. The great trouble with most religious books written to-day is that they lack intrinsic value, not only because they are full of falsehoods, but because they are written for the hour. Perhaps there is no other market so apt to cheat the public as the book market. In nine cases out of ten the buyer is likely to get a useless, indifferent, or even dangerous book. If ever Christian pastors and laymen had reason to be careful in investing their money in books, it is right now. Lutheran Christians will do well to confer with their publishing houses before purchasing books on religion. MUELLER.

Roma Semper Eadem.—A notice in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (September 23) informs the readers that the noonday devotions at the Old Cathedral on Second and Walnut Sts. during October will "consist of the rosary devotion and in November of prayers for the holy souls and benediction. The rule of a plenary indulgence is in force for those who visit the Old Cathedral, this being the same as is imparted to those visiting the seven churches at Rome." D.

BOOK REVIEW.

Walther League, Chicago, Ill.: —

The Bible Student. A Bible Study Quarterly for Young People, Adult Classes, and the Home. *Th. Graebner*, Editor. Vol. I. No. 1. July, 1922. 50 pages.

The cooperative method suggested in the directions for the use of this quarterly by classes seems very good, because it gives every member of the class something definite to do, wisely distributes responsibility for the success of the joint work to every member, and thus intensifies individual interest. The use of the Bible in connection with the lessons is insisted on. Edification is made a prominent feature of the lessons, which are made fine devotional exercises, penetration of Scripture truths, prayers, and singing of hymns being aptly fused in each lesson. The suggestions for daily reading expand the doctrinal and practical points made in the lesson and

deepen its message. Altogether, this Bible Study Quarterly comes with the promise of a great mission. May the Lord bless the fine labor bestowed on it by the editor, and the labor which the thousands who are to use it will bestow on it!

D.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.:—

Minutes of the Sixty-Second Annual Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod in North America, Held in Chicago, Ill., June 8—13, 1921.

The President, Dr. G. A. Brandelle, in his annual report of the convention, said, among other things: "The attendance at the services has probably increased, and, as a rule, the morning services are quite diligently attended. Sometimes it is stated that the majority in attendance at these services are elderly people. On the other hand, the evening services are not wholly agreeable to our people. . . . The English language is used more and more at our services. In one of our conferences half of the morning services are conducted in English. In the same conference 75 per cent. of all evening services are English. Two of our conferences have made English their official language. . . .

"Sunday-school work is conducted everywhere, but the work is far from satisfactory, considered as a whole. . . . The instruction of the catechumens seems to be conducted with earnestness. In most cases the children are instructed eight or nine months, in rare cases ten months, and in a few instances even from one to two years. . . . Almost universally the moral condition is said to be good. But there is a general complaint that so many are devoted to pleasures, such as the dance, the theater, and gambling. . . . In many places the customary programs for young people's meetings have been changed to Bible-study.

"The liberality of our people is commendable. From all directions comes the news that the people are anxious to take care of the local needs and also assist as regards our common needs. The envelope system is being introduced in a constantly increasing number of congregations. Its success is noticeable everywhere. Through its use the income of the congregations is surprisingly increased. . . .

"The undersigned was present at the meeting of the Ohio Synod in Blue Island, Ill., last August and presented the greetings of our Synod. The Ohio Synod, by resolution, decided to ask our Synod to appoint a committee of three members to meet with a like committee from their Synod for the purpose of discussing our Synod's position in the matter of faith and practise.

"At the invitation of its president, Dr. Knubel, the undersigned attended the second convention of the United Lutheran Church at Washington, D. C., last fall and presented to this venerable body the greetings of our Synod."

From the report of the Board of the Augustana Book Concern we quote the following: "The increasing cost of material and salaries, without a corresponding increase in the volume of business, has prevented the financial success being what it should have been. . . . Although the income from *Augustana* has increased by \$2,063.09, the cost has increased to such an extent that the paper has been published at a loss of \$1,051.26; that in spite of an increased income of \$1,919.57 for the *Lutheran Companion*, the loss

from its publication is \$3,063.54 larger. . . . The circulation of *Augustana* has increased by 36, and the *Lutheran Companion* by 738 copies. In the circulation of the other papers there has been a decrease in the number of copies as follows: *Barnens Tidning*, 6,170; the *Olive Leaf*, 3,828; *Textblad*, 738; *Solglinten*, 675; *Solstralen*, 400. On the other hand, it is very gratifying to note that the sale of books has increased by \$25,065.01; that the cash income has been larger by \$44,369.45; that the volume of business has been \$257,413.27, which is an increase of \$44,377.79; that, in spite of the increased expenses, there has been a net gain of \$9,023.27.

"Since the days of the war the language question has become doubly acute. The Synod seems to hasten to the exclusive use of the English language. The Board is aware of the situation, as is proved by the list of books and papers which have been published. The need of more devotional books, song-books, helps for the Sunday-schools, and papers in English, is on the increase constantly. The demand for text-books in English at our colleges is growing. The Theological Seminary is no exception to this rule. . . .

"It is apparent that the only way in which a loss may be avoided by our publication house during these times of high cost of living is an increased sale of our books and papers. It is also equally apparent that the prevailing conditions in our Synod seriously admonish to an increased and more persistent effort in the whole Synod for the benefit of our publishing house. One present great need of our people is good Christian literature. The flood of literature reflecting the unbelief, the materialism, and the sensuality of our age threatens to engulf our people, especially the children and the young folks, in spiritual and eternal death. On this account the Board would lay it on the hearts of all members of the Synod and of the pastors in particular that it is a precious duty and a great privilege to disseminate Christian literature without ceasing. 'Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.' Our Christian publication activity is really a mission-work." FRITZ.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:—

The Voice of Russia. *M. Alexander Schwartz.* 223 pages.

To introduce this book fully to our readers we would need to do no more than to suggest as its subtitle: *The Disillusionment of an American Communist and His Wife.* Mr. and Mrs. Schwartz were prominent in communistic-socialistic circles in America, and went to Russia to find their dreams of a social republic realized there. They found Bolshevism and studied its diabolical work. Mrs. Schwartz lost her life in a Bolshevik prison. Mr. Schwartz tells the story of what he and his wife heard and saw in Red Russia. The book is an indictment of the principles and practises of the social revolution which is preached to-day in every civilized country as the great salvation of the people from all their ills. D.

Creeds or No Creeds? *A Critical Examination of the Basis of Modernism.* *Charles Harris, D. D.* 383 pages.

It is a cheering sign that the vagaries of subjective idealism, which have filled the useful fields of theology and philosophy with a prodigious growth of noxious cockle, are being subjected more and more to searching

criticism by competent scholars, who still have a reverence in their hearts for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is cheering to see the astounding ignorance and puerile logic of "great thinkers" exposed, to hear the cocksure oracles of science invited to do some sound and accurate thinking, and to find the sworn enemies of *a priori* truth hopelessly chained to their own *a priori* critical conclusions. The modern attack on dogma, fixed formulas of truths, deposits of doctrine, creeds, etc., is in the light of this scholarly investigation seen in its contemptible shallowness, its boundless conceit, and its hollow pretense and arrogance. The Lord give His Church more such testimonies for the immutable and irreformable truth of apostles and prophets, on which the Church is built, with Jesus Christ as the chief Corner-stone, and which has been reiterated again and again amid the changes of centuries in the Christian creeds. This is the third book of the kind that has come from this author's pen. He is a member of the Anglican Church, and his present publication is given to the public with special recommendations by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield and by the Warden of Waldham College, Oxford. But in this treatise he does not expound the peculiar Anglican faith. If the treatise contains any attempt of that sort, it has escaped us. The treatise, however, takes issue at every vital point with the claims of modern Liberal Protestantism, which the author rightly holds to be Unitarian at best and pantheistic and blasphemous where it appears at its worst. The modern views of authority, dogma, immanence, human knowledge, relativity, God, Christ, the atonement, immortality and the future life, resurrection, etc., are critically examined. The author is thoroughly at home in the literature of the tendencies which he reviews. We have space only for a few excerpts to exhibit the author's workmanship. On the development of doctrine he says, p. 22 f.: "No Christian in our day denies the development of doctrine, perhaps no Christian who has reflected upon the subject has ever denied it. In the fourth gospel the Doctrine of Development is taught explicitly by Christ Himself ('I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all [the] Truth,' 16, 12). The context shows that the guidance of the Spirit is promised to the apostles and their successors *collectively*, so that here Christ definitely contemplates development, not merely in the teaching of individual theologians, but in the official and authoritative teaching of the Christian Church. In the synoptic gospels, Christ teaches the same doctrine implicitly, as when He compares Christian teaching to a seed planted by a Sower (*i. e.*, Himself), which grows and matures and brings forth fruit, and to a grain of mustard-seed, which becomes a great tree which overshadows the earth. On the other hand, the teaching of Christ is represented as absolutely true, and therefore unchangeable ('Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away,' Mark 13, 31). Accordingly, Christian truth is a treasure to be guarded, a tradition to be faithfully kept, a 'deposit of faith' for which an account must be rendered ('O Timothy, guard *the deposit*, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge falsely so called,' 1 Tim. 6, 20; cf. 2 Tim. 1, 12—14). Neither St. Paul nor St. John can possibly have been unaware that their own teaching represents a *development* of the explicit teaching of the Master, nevertheless each regards his own teaching as *identical* with the original Gospel preached by

Christ. St. Paul even insists that the meaning of the original Gospel cannot be changed without apostasy ('Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed,' Gal. 1, 8). The Scriptural idea of development is, therefore, *development without change*. This is undoubtedly a paradox, but by no means a contradiction, as will appear later." On the contested "ransom passage" in Matthew he says, p. 227 f.: "Dr. Rashdall rejects as spurious, without the support of a particle of evidence, the great ransom passage, which concludes with the words, 'and to give His life a ransom for many (*λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν*),' although it is contained, not only in *Matthew* (20, 28), but also in *Mark*, our oldest Gospel (10, 45). Here again the subjective point of view is far too much in evidence. He has a strong dislike (which he takes no pains to conceal) to the ordinary or 'objective' theory of the atonement, and as this theory seems to be taught, or at least favored, by this passage, he decides that it ought to be eliminated. — There is a further objection to its authenticity from Dr. Rashdall's theological standpoint, *viz.*, that it collides with his theory that Jesus, though truly divine, was unaware of the fact. Obviously, if Jesus regarded His death, not as a mere human martyrdom, but as a supernatural event, altering for the better the whole status of the human race in the sight of God, winning pardon for racial and individual sin, and initiating a new and everlasting covenant between the Creator and the creature (as this saying, taken in connection with the words at the institution of the Eucharist, naturally suggests, and as the strong corroboration of the Petrine, the Pauline, and the Johannine epistles renders an almost certain fact), then it is beyond all doubt that He regarded Himself as a *superhuman*, and almost certainly as a *divine* Person. Jesus, however, according to Dr. Rashdall, was entirely ignorant of His own divinity; therefore He cannot have used words which suggest it; therefore He cannot have uttered either of the two great sayings which imply that His death was a sacrifice for sin or a ransom for many. Dr. Rashdall's only real argument against Jesus having taught the doctrine of an objective atonement is that it seems inconsistent with the teaching of the Parable of the Prodigal Son, that the only condition of pardon which God requires on the part of a sinner is that he should repent. Even if the Dean is right, and the only necessary condition of pardon on man's part is repentance, it does not in any way follow that no other condition is necessary on God's part. For anything we know to the contrary, God may owe it to the violated majesty of the eternal Moral Law and to His own holiness to make such an atonement for human sin, as orthodox Christians believe He has actually made through the incarnation and death of His eternal Son." In view of the valuable service which this book may render otherwise, the author's view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is to be regretted. He says on p. 188: "Strange as it may appear, there is not any ecumenical definition even of Biblical inspiration. No orthodox Christian is now, or ever has been, required to believe as part of his faith, either that the Bible is free from historical and scientific errors, or that it contains no human element, or that it is equally inspired in all its parts, or that God is its 'Author' (*auctor*) in a literary sense." How this view will practically work out in the author's treatment of Scripture in particular instances it is not easy to foretell.

The Macmillan Company, New York:—

Christian Work as a Vocation. *Henry H. Tweedy, Harlan P. Beach, Judson J. McKim.* 44 pages. \$1.00.

This book aims to acquaint young men who contemplate entering Christian service as a life vocation with the opportunities offered to them in 1) the ministry, 2) the foreign mission field, and 3) Y. M. C. A. work. It contains three essays on the subjects mentioned. While we are not in accord with what the author says in recommending the Y. M. C. A., there are many things in the article on "The Ministry" and "The Foreign Missionary's Calling" which strike us as very practical. Of the ministry, Professor Tweedy says: "To Brooke's mind all honest work was a kind of divine service, all loving labor holy. But the work of the modern minister was so inspiring and so joyous, so magnificent in its opportunities, and so rich in its rewards, that in his big-heartedness he wished that every man might share in its gladness and its glories, and taste the fulness of the life that made his own cup of thankfulness overflow." (p. 3.) In another statement he says: "Selfish and formal leadership spells stagnation, while vicious leadership will inflict tragedy upon all that good men hold dear. When the leadership of the Church declines, the best life of the people declines. Witness the conditions during the Dark Ages and the spiritual depression of the eighteenth century. One of the supreme needs of the world in this great crisis of history is a ministry manned by men who are equal to their task." (p. 10.) Of poor salaries the author says: "Poor salaries are paid to only two classes in the profession: poor workmen who would probably not receive large salaries in any other field, and heroes who for Christ's sake have deliberately chosen to be poor. The first group earns all that it is worth as ministers, whatever its value to society might be if its members chose occupations to which they were better adapted. In general, however, a good minister earns as much as a good teacher or the average man in a number of professions. . . . If he is never a Dives, neither will he ever be a Lazarus; and his wages will be adequate to the majority of modest wants as well as to all absolute needs." (pp. 33—35.) Apart from various statements with which the reviewer could not agree, and several aims with which he could not be in sympathy, he found especially the first two essays very instructive and inspiring. MUELLER.

Modern Christian Callings. Edited by *E. Hershey Sneath.* 89 pages. 75 cts.

The modern Christian callings which are set forth and recommended to young men in this book are "Biblical Teaching in School and College," "Executives for Christian Enterprises," and "Opportunities for Social Work." The first essay, written by Irving F. Wood, Professor of Biblical Literature and Comparative Religion, Smith College, treats of the opportunities offered to young men in schools and colleges to teach religious subjects, such as psychology, history and philosophy of religion, ethics, Biblical history, Biblical literature, Biblical religion, Biblical language, history of Christianity, social problems of Christianity, the propagation of Christianity, etc. As the author believes, the study of Biblical subjects will, in the future, be far more popular in our schools, colleges, and high schools than it has been in the past. He says: "Over three hundred colleges in the United States offer a certain amount of Bible work." (p. 5.)

Of course, these subjects are to be taught mainly for cultural purposes, although the practical purpose must not be set aside. However, the author rightly remarks: "One cannot study the books of the Bible from a purely literary point of view without finding himself soon in the presence of a religious ideal." (p. 10.) Hence the teacher of the Bible must of necessity be a teacher of religion. This religion, however, must neither be static nor conservative. The writer declares: "The Church especially needs pastors who will neither interpret Biblical religion narrowly, nor be obliged to abandon the Bible and its teachings when they approach the gravest problems of modern life because they are fundamentally ignorant of the foundation principles of its teaching." (p. 11.) What the author means he explains in the following remarks: "People of conservative points of view sometimes complain that the modern college teacher of the Bible 'upsets' his students; that his teaching tends to unsettle the faith of their childhood. That depends very largely on what the faith of their childhood was. If it was a static faith, staking all religion on the truth of certain opinions about the Bible,—*e. g.*, that its science and history must be accurate, or else its religion is false,—and on the correctness of certain theological doctrines, then the student does not need to reach the Bible class to be 'upset.' Science and philosophy usually do the work. As a matter of fact, the Bible department, in such cases, often performs the part of a wrecking expedition, rescuing the remnants of a shattered faith and showing the students how they may build a stable foundation for religious life. If the faith of their childhood provided for growth and change with the growing, changing life, then there is no 'upsetting,' no wrecking of faith by Biblical or any other study. Then religion simply expands with the progress of knowledge as plants expand in the sunshine and shower of the spring, naturally, easily, without struggle or strain. This is what should be." (p. 11.) In other words, the religious instruction of the child should be liberalistic from the very beginning, in order that its faith may not be destroyed by the infidelity of its later instructors in religion in the schools and universities.

The second essay deals largely with executive work in missionary societies, while the third offers a good survey of the various activities of present-day social work. Any one wishing to acquaint himself with these particular branches may study the book with profit. It shows, above all, the universal interest which men now take in religious work, although this has drifted far away from the original command of the Savior to preach the Gospel.

MUELLER.

Thomas Seltzer, New York:—

Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious. *D. H. Lawrence.* 120 pages. \$2.00.

This is a wearisome book on a dreary subject. Mr. Lawrence investigates the *unconscious* of Freudian philosophy and offers a new explanation in its place. With regard to the Freudian Oedipus complex, incest motives, and other passionial or sexual cravings, the writer is utterly out of sympathy, and he very strikingly shows what conclusions psychoanalysts must draw. He says: "After all he has said about inhibition of normal sex, he is brought at last to realize that at the root of almost every neurosis lies some incest-craving, and that this incest-craving is not the

result of inhibition of normal sex-craving. Now see the dilemma — it is a fearful one. . . . Once you accept the incest-craving as part of the normal sexuality of man, you must remove all repression of incest itself. In fact, you must admit incest as you now admit sexual marriage, as a duty even, since neurosis is not the result of inhibition of so-called *normal* sex, but of inhibition of incest-craving. Any inhibition must be wrong, since inevitably in the end it causes neurosis and insanity. Therefore the inhibition of incest-craving is wrong, and this wrong is the cause of practically all modern neurosis and insanity. Psychoanalysis will never openly state this conclusion. But it is to this conclusion that every analyst must, willy-nilly, consciously or unconsciously, bring his patient." (pp. 20. 21.) Having rejected the psychoanalyst's explanation of the unconscious, he offers the following elucidation in its place. He writes: "At last we form some sort of notion what the unconscious actually is. It is that active spontaneity which rouses in each individual organism at the moment of fusion of the parent nuclei, and which, in polarized connection with the external universe, gradually evolves or elaborates its own individual *psyche* and *corpus*, bringing both mind and body forth from itself. Thus it would seem that the term unconscious is only another word for life. But life is a general force, whereas the unconscious is essentially single and unique in each individual organism; it is the active, self-evolving soul bringing forth its own incarnation and self-manifestation. Which incarnation and self-manifestation seems to be the whole goal of the unconscious soul: the whole goal of life." (pp. 102. 103.) Again: "We can quite tangibly deal with the human unconscious. We trace its source and centers in the great ganglia and nodes of the nervous system. We establish the nature of the spontaneous consciousness at each of these centers; we determine the polarity and the direction of the polarized flow. And from this we know the motion and individual manifestation of the *psyche* itself; we also know the motion and rhythm of the great organs of the body." (pp. 104. 105.) Of love the writer says: "The amazingly difficult and vital business of human relationship has been almost laughably underestimated in our epoch. All this nonsense about love and unselfishness, more crude and repugnant than savage fetish-worship. Love is a thing to be *learned*, through centuries of patient effort. It is a difficult, complex maintenance of individual integrity throughout the incalculable processes of interhuman-polarity. Even on the first great plane of consciousness, four prime poles in each individual, four powerful circuits possible between two individuals, and each of the four circuits to be established to perfection and yet maintained in pure equilibrium with all the others. Who can do it? Nobody. Yet we have all got to do it, or else suffer ascetic tortures of starvation and privation or of distortion and overstrain and slow collapse into corruption. The whole of life is one long, blind effort at an established polarity with the outer universe, human and non-human; and the whole of modern life is a shrieking failure. It is our own fault." (pp. 110—112.) The author closes his book with the following confession: "So the few things we have to say about the unconscious end for the moment. There is almost nothing said." With these opening words of the closing paragraph, the reader will no doubt be in sympathy. At least, the reader will close the book with the dreary feeling that he has understood nothing.

MUELLER.